REMARKS

In the final Office Action dated September 11, 2006, the Examiner objects to claim 47 for including an informality, rejects claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention; rejects claims 1, 13-17, 21 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON (U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051) in view of non-patent document entitled "How to Interpret your Search Results" (GOOGLE1), further in view of non-patent document entitled "The Anatomy of a Large-Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine" (BRIN et al.); rejects claims 2, 3, 48, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of BRIN et al., and still further in view of BAXTER et al.(U.S. Publication No. 2003/0229637); rejects claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of BRIN et al., further in view of SMITH (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,076); rejects claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of BRIN et al., further in view of MITCHELL et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,966); rejects claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of BRIN et al. in view of MITCHELL et al., further in view of BAXTER et al.; rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of BRIN et al., further in view of CRAGUN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,212); rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of BRIN et al., further in

view of non-patent document entitled "Google Search Technology" (GOOGLE2); rejects claims 22, 26-28, 30 and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of SMITH; rejects claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of SMITH, further in view of BAXTER et al.; rejects claims 31 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of SMITH, further in view of MITCHELL et al.; rejects claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of SMITH in view of MITCHELL et al., further in view of BAXTER et al.; rejects claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of SMITH, further in view of CRAGUN et al.; rejects claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of SMITH, further in view of GOOGLE2; rejects claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1 in view of SMITH in view of BRIN et al., further in view of MITCHELL et al.; and rejects claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of BAXTER et al. in view of Google1, further in view of SMITH. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 1-24, 26-28, 30-43, and 47-49 were pending in the present application prior to the proposed amendments. By way of this amendment, Applicant proposes canceling claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer and amending claims 1, 5-8, 12, 17, 21, 41, and 47 to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendments. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-28, 30-43, and 47-49

would remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to claim 47 for allegedly including a minor informality. More specifically, the Examiner indicated that claim 47 erroneously recites "a ranked listed" rather than a "ranked listing" (Final Office Action – para. 15). Claim 47 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner to overcome the noted objection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 47 are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated that "the ranked characterizations" in line 3 of claim 41 allegedly lacks a proper antecedent basis (Final Office Action – Pg. 8). Proposed claim 41 has been amended to correct the alleged antecedent basis of this term and recite "the integrated ranked listing of relevant characterizations". A proper antecedent basis for this term may be found in claim 22, from which claim 41 depends. In view of this proposed amendment, the rejection of claim 41 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 13-17, 21, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view GOOGLE1 and further in view of BRIN et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires that three basic criteria be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. do not disclose or reasonably suggest the combination of features recited in Applicant's claims 1, 13-17, 21, and 47, as amended.

For example, independent claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method including storing in a searchable database data sets representing printed items from publications respectively printed by a plurality of respective publishers, each data set including text from at least one of the printed items, wherein storing data sets representing printed items includes storing data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed items; storing an index representing information included in a plurality of web documents; receiving a search query; searching the index for web documents that are relevant to the search query; searching the data sets in the searchable database for

data sets representing printed items that are relevant to the search query; generating an integrated ranked listing comprising at least one characterization of at least one of the relevant web documents and at least one characterization of at least one of the relevant printed items; and for said at least one of the relevant printed items, providing an electronic reference for accessing further information. The cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. do not disclose or reasonably suggest the combination of features recited in Applicant's claim 1.

For example, the combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. does not disclose or suggest wherein storing data sets representing printed items includes storing data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed items, as recited in proposed amended claim 1. In fact, THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. are completely silent with respect to the feature of providing advertisement information in each data set representing printed items or providing information relating to the advertisement with identified relevant characterizations of at least one relevant printed item. For at least this reason claim 22 is patentable overt the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al.

It should be noted, however, that the above-recited feature of proposed claim 1 has been added to claim 1 by way of the presently proposed amendment. However, subject matter similar to these features was originally recited in claim 4. In rejecting original claim 4, the Examiner acknowledged that the combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. did not disclose storing data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed items (Final Office Action -- pp. 22). In the interests of expeditious prosecution, Applicant hereby addresses a potential rejection of

proposed claim 1 based on the currently pending rejection of claim 4. Accordingly, it is noted that in remedying the noted deficiency with respect to the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al., the Examiner relied upon cols. 2, line 59 through col. 3, line 5 of SMITH for allegedly disclosing storing data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed item (Final Office Action, pg. 22). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of SMITH.

Cols. 2, line 59 through col. 3, line 5 of SMITH discloses:

> The retailer can add, update, and delete information about advertisements in the retail self-service terminal database. Adding information about an advertisement consists of specifying: (1) a description of the advertisement; (2) a time value, in seconds, that defines how long the ad should appear; (3) a uniform resource locator (URL) defining the content that appears when a consumer interacts with the ad that is displayed; (4) a weighting factor that is used to determine the number of successive times the ad should be displayed within an attract loop; (5) a URL defining the actual advertisement content; and (6) an advertisement media type (for example, GIF image, MPEG video, ASF streaming video, and so forth).

This section of SMITH discloses that advertisement information may be updated to include various elements, such as a description time of display, URL, media, etc. This section of SMITH does not disclose storing a data set relating to printed items, where the data set includes information representing an advertisement printed with the at least one of the printed items. In fact, SMITH does not disclose advertisements associated with printed items at all. Rather, the advertisements of SMITH appear to be web-specific advertisements created for display to customers in a self-service retail environment.

In applying the advertisements of SMITH with the advertisement information of original claim 4 (now included in proposed claim 1), the Examiner indicated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine SMITH with THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. because these inventions use computers to display documents (Final Office Action – pg. 22).

Additionally, the Examiner further alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to take the database of ads with their associated information from SMITH and install it into the invention of THOMSON (as modified by GOOGLE1 and BRIN et al.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of storing/maintaining the ads independently which allows for advertisements to be modified independently, and the reuse/repeating of the same advertisement multiple times (Final Office Action – pp. 22-23).

Still furthermore, although the Examiner acknowledges that THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., or SMITH do not disclose that the advertisements are associated with printed items, the Examiner takes Official notice that to get the advantage of complete document integrity, it is necessary to include advertisements in the storing of printed items that contain advertisements (Final Office Action – pg. 23).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has clearly constructed Applicants proposed claim 1 based on an impermissible hindsight-based scavenger hunt among numerous prior art references and a vague reference to Official notice. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, proposed claim 1 does not recite storing the advertisements in the storing of the printed items containing the advertisements. Rather, proposed claim 1 recites storing data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed items. The distinction being that the data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed items are distinct from, but associated with, the data sets representing the printed items.

Absent some additional suggestion in SMITH, it is unclear how the web or server-based advertisements of SMITH disclose or suggest the storage of data sets representing advertisements in data sets associated with printed items, as required by proposed claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over the implicit combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., and SMITH previously applied to claims 4-9. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-17 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Moreover, in the event that the Examiner applies SMITH in the manner described above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-17 are patentable over the combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., and SMITH for at least the reasons set forth in the above arguments. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-17 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 21 includes subject matter similar to, yet possibly different in scope than claim 1. Accordingly, claim 21 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al., as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Proposed independent claim 47 includes subject matter similar to, yet possibly different in scope than proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claim 47 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al, and SMITH for at least reasons

similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 47 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 48, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of BRIN et al., and still further in view of BAXTER et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. The disclosure of BAXTER et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al., as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., SMITH, and BAXTER et al., for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 3 are respectfully requested.

Claims 48 and 49 depend from proposed claim 47. The disclosure of BAXTER et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al., as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH, for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1 (or the implied rejection in view of noted above, with respect to claim 47. Accordingly, claims 48 and 49 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al. and BAXTER et al., for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 47. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 48 and 49 are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of BRIN et al., and still further in view of SMITH. Applicant respectfully traverse.

Claims 4-9 depend from claim 1. By way of the presently proposed amendment, Applicant proposes canceling claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer. The remaining remarks address the rejection of claims 5-9. More specifically, Applicant submits that the disclosure of SMITH does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. noted above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claims 5-9 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., and SMITH, for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recited additional features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH.

For example, claim 8 recites that the returning at least one characterization of at least one of the relevant printed items includes returning information from a data set representing an advertisement for said at least one of the relevant printed items. THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., and SMITH do not disclosure or reasonably suggest this feature. In rejecting claim 8, the Examiner again relied upon cols. 2-3, lines 59-5 of SMITH for allegedly disclosing storing data sets representing advertisements printed with the printed item (Final Office Action, pg. 24). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of SMITH.

As described above, the cited section of SMITH discloses web or server-based advertisements viewing in a self-service retail environment. As disclosed, the advertisement information of SMITH may be updated to include various elements, such as a description time of display, URL, media, etc. However, the cited section of SMITH

makes no disclosure whatsoever relating to the returning at least one characterization of at least one of the relevant printed items including returning information from a data set representing an advertisement for said at least one of the relevant printed items, as required by claim 8. On the contrary, SMITH is not related to providing advertisements with respect to search results whatsoever and merely provides updatable, flexible advertising in a retail environment. The Examiner indicates that the characterization return portion of claim 8 is taught by THOMSON and that SMITH merely discloses that the stored information may include advertisement (Final Office Action – pg. 5). However, merely disclosing the storage of advertisements, would not motivate one skilled in the art to return information from a data set representing an advertisement for said at least one of the relevant printed items, as required by claim 8.

For at least this additional reason, claim 8 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., and SMITH. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 are respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of BRIN et al., and further in view of MITCHELL et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 10 and 20 depend from claim 1. The disclosure of MITCHELL et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al. as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10 and 20 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., SMITH, and MITCHELL et al., for at least the

reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 20 are respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view GOOGLE1, in view of BRIN et al., in view of MITCHELL et al., and further in view of BAXTER et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 11 and 12 depends from claim 1. The disclosures of MITCHELL et al. and BAXTER et al. do not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and BRIN et al., as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., SMITH, MITCHELL et al., and BAXTER et al. for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 are respectfully requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of BRIN et al., and still further in view of CRAGUN et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 18 depends from claim 1. The disclosure of CRAGUN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON and GOOGLE1 and BRIN et al., as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH, for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., SMITH, and CRAGUN et al., for at least the reasons set forth

above, with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 are respectfully requested.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of BRIN et al., and still further in view of GOOGLE2. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1. The disclosure of GOOGLE2 does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON and GOOGLE1 and BRIN et al., as well as the implied combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al, and SMITH, for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, BRIN et al., SMITH, and GOOGLE2, for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 are respectfully requested.

Claims 22, 26-28, 30, and 34-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, and further in view of SMITH. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 22 includes subject matter similar to (yet possibly different in scope than) proposed claim 1. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to proposed claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-28, 30, and 34-38 depend from claim 22. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH, for at

least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26-28, 30, and 34-38 are respectfully requested.

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of SMITH, and still further in view of BAXTER et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 22. The disclosure of BAXTER et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH noted above with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, claims 23 and 24 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, SMITH, and BAXTER et al., for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 and 24 are respectfully requested.

Claims 31 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of SMITH, and still further in view of MITCHELL et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 31 and 42 depend from claim 22. The disclosure of MITCHELL et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH noted above with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, claims 31 and 42 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, SMITH, and MITCHELL et al., for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31 and 42 are respectfully requested.

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view GOOGLE1, in view of SMITH, further in view of MITCHELL

et al., and still further in view of BAXTER et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 32 and 33 depends from claim 22. The disclosures of MITCHELL et al. and BAXTER et al. do not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH noted above, with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, claims 32 and 33 are patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, SMITH, MITCHELL et al., and BAXTER et al. for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32 and 33 are respectfully requested.

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of SMITH, and still further in view of CRAGUN et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 39 depends from claim 22. The disclosure of CRAGUN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH noted above, with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, claim 39 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, SMITH, and CRAGUN et al., for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 39 are respectfully requested.

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of SMITH, and still further in view of GOOGLE2. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 40 depends from claim 22. The disclosure of GOOGLE2 does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH noted above, with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, claim 40 is patentable over the cited combination

of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, SMITH, and GOOGLE2, for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 40 are respectfully requested.

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of GOOGLE1, further in view of SMITH, still further in view of BRIN et al., and yet further in view of MITCHELL et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 41 depends from claim 22. The disclosures of BRIN et al. and MITCHELL et al. do not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, and SMITH noted above with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, claim 41 is patentable over the cited combination of THOMSON, GOOGLE1, SMITH, BRIN et al., and MITCHELL et al., for at least the reasons set forth above, with respect to claim 22. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 41 are respectfully requested.

Claim 43 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over THOMSON in view of BAXTER et al., further in view of GOOGLE1, and still further in view of SMITH. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 43 recites an arrangement for maintaining an electronic database that is searchable via a search engine in response to Internet-based search queries. The arrangement includes means for storing in the searchable database data sets representing printed items from publications respectively printed by a plurality of respective publishers, each data set including text from at least one of the printed items, wherein the data sets representing printed items include advertisements related to the printed items, the advertisements including information for linking to information about a corresponding product; with each stored data set representing printed items from

publications, means for recording whether the respective publisher has authorized display of the printed item; means, responsive to a search query and including the search engine, for searching for web pages that are relevant for the search query and searching the data sets in the electronic database for data sets that are relevant to the search query, thereby identifying relevant Internet web pages and relevant data sets corresponding to relevant publication items; means for returning at least one characterization of at least one of the relevant web pages and at least one characterization of at least one of the relevant publication items and, for said at least one of the relevant publication items for which the respective publisher has authorized display, providing an electronic path for accessing a copyrighted version thereof, wherein the means for returning at least one characterization of the relevant publication items includes returning information from an advertisement for said at least one of the relevant printed items. The cited combination of THOMSON, BAXTER et al., GOOGLE1 and SMITH does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 43.

For example, the combination of THOMSON, BAXTER et al., GOOGLE1 and SMITH does not disclose or reasonably suggest the data sets representing printed items include advertisements related to the printed items, the advertisements including information for linking to information about a corresponding product, and wherein the means for returning at least one characterization of the relevant publication items includes returning information from an advertisement for said at least one of the relevant printed items, as recited in claim 43. In rejecting original claim 43, the Examiner relied on col. 2, line 59 through col. 3, line 5 of SMITH for allegedly disclosing storing

advertisements printed with the printed item (Office Action, pg. 43). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of SMITH.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, col. 2 line 59 through col. 3, line 5 of SMITH discloses that advertisement information may be updated to include various elements, such as a description time of display, URL, media, etc. This section of SMITH does not disclose that the data sets representing printed items include advertisements related to the printed items, the advertisements including information for linking to information about a corresponding product, as required by claim 43. In fact, SMITH does not disclose advertisements associated with printed items at all. Rather, the advertisements of SMITH appear to be web-specific advertisements created for display to customers in a self-service retail environment. Absent some additional suggestion in SMITH, it is unclear how the web or server-based advertisements of SMITH disclose or suggest that the data sets representing printed items include advertisements related to the printed items, the advertisements including information for linking to information about a corresponding product, as required by claim 43. For at least this reason, claim 43 is patentable over the implicit combination of THOMSON, BAXTER et al., GOOGLE1, and SMITH. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 43 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application. In the event that the application is not believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment since the amendment merely amends the independent

claims to include features similar to those recited in previously presented claims. In addition, in the event that the application is not believed to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the number shown below to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Robin C. Clark/
Robin C. Clark
Registration No. 40,956

Date: December 11, 2006

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44989